

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **July 14, 2004** the Examiner reviewed claims 1-61. Claims 1, 3-6, 10-16, 18-21, 25-31, 33-36, and 40-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Rundensteiner et al. (“Maintaining Data Warehouses Over Changing Information Sources,” ACM 2000, hereinafter “Rundensteiner”). Claims 2, 7-9, 17, 22-24, 32, and 37-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Rundensteiner in view of Henninger, (USPN 5,499,371, hereinafter “Henninger”).

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Dependent claims 2, 17, and 32 were rejected as being unpatentable over Rundensteiner in view of Henninger. Applicant respectfully points out that Henninger teaches using primary keys to uniquely **identify each row in a table** (see Henninger, col. 6, lines 56-57).

In contrast, the present invention uses a key to **identify a document** in a markup language such as XML (see page 4, lines 23-24 of the instant application). Identifying a document in XML is different than identifying a row in a table. Identifying a document in XML allows the document to be imported and the contents placed in an object, while identifying each row in a table allows various tables to be linked using the key fields. There is nothing within Rundensteiner or Henninger, either separately or in concert, which suggests using a key to identify a document in a markup language.

Accordingly, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 16, 31, 47, and 56-61 to include the limitations from claims 2, 17, and 32 in order to clarify that the present invention uses a key to identify a document in a markup language such as XML. These amendments find support on page 4, lines 23-24 of the


instant application. Dependent claims 2, 17, and 32 have been canceled without prejudice.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 16, 31, 47, and 56-61 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that claims 3-15, which depend upon claim 1, claims 18-30, which depend upon claim 16, claims 33-46, which depend upon claim 31, and claims 48-55, which depend upon claim 47, are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the present application is presently in form for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Edward J. Grundler
Registration No. 47, 615

Date: September 7, 2004

Edward J. Grundler
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
508 Second Street, Suite 201
Davis, CA 95616-4692
Tel: (530) 759-1663
FAX: (530) 759-1665

RECEIVED
SEP 14 2004
Technology Center 2100